DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 083 SP 010 645

AUTHOR	Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Ed.
TITLE	The Multi-Disciplinary Graduate Program in Educational Research. Final Report, Part VII; Evaluation of the Multi-Disciplinary Program in Educational Research.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. Learning Research and Development Center.
PUB DATE	Mar 75
NOTE	24p.; For introduction and other related documents, see SP 010 639-45
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Doctoral Programs; Educational Innovation; *Graduate Study; Group Discussion; Group Dynamics; Higher Education; *Intellectual Disciplines; *Interaction Process Analysis; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Perceptual Development; Self Actualization; Summative Evaluation; Units of Study (Subject Fields)

ABSTRACT

In the Multi-Disciplinary Graduate Program in Educational Research, graduate students at the doctoral level were participants. This program required exposure to other disciplines, to various approaches to problem definition, to various methodologies, concepts, and research techniques. It was expected that the students had gained experiences and acquired competencies within their individual disciplines. The subject of education research was chosen as being broad enough in scope to encompass other disciplines and to aid the students in their explorations in their own fields. In the group participating in the program the following disciplines were represented: information sciences, clinical psychology, economics, social psychology, pediatric psychology, counselor education, educational anthropology, sociology, educational psychology, and educational research. Under the guidance of experienced leaders, seminars were conducted; guest speakers contributed on different subjects; and there was frequent informal interchange between participants. Many students found that they gained an understanding of the strengths and limitations of their own discipline as well as those of other disciplines. At a future date the data collected from this program will be analysed, evaluated, and published. The methodology involved will be included for guidance of those who may wish to conduct a similar program. (JD)

Final Report

Recommend approval as project Final Report
10/15/76

The Multi-Disciplinary Graduate Program in Educational Research

Paul F. Lazarsfeld

LEARNING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

March, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EVALUATION

One of the potentially valuable spin-off products of the Multi-disciplinary Program in Educational Research at the University of Pittsburgh has been the interest generated among university administrators and faculty members in the possibility of developing new evaluative measures for programs in higher education. The idea of bringing together persons who were experts in evaluative technology with humanists from a variety of disciplines was initiated in order to evaluate our own program. It was recognized that although philosophers, literary critics and some social scientists do not necessarily use the term evaluation, their activities may be considered relevant to evaluation of complex programs. Although our program was terminated before the outcomes of this approach were available, a number of the participants will continue this activity. The potential of this enterprise has been recognized by administrators responsible for the academic programs within the university. The insights that may be gained from this endeavor could have applicability to education that would allow us to go beyond the evaluation/technology now available.

While this more intellectually sophisticated approach to evaluation is being developed, more traditional evaluation has been conducted. Since we were simultaneously conducting a program and developing materials for dissemination, evaluation was expected to both provide feedback to improve the program as it was being conducted and to suggest how future programs could take advantage of our experiences with processes and our products.

Evaluation has been a continuous process throughout the conduct of the program and evaluative feedback became a basis for revision. There were several types of evaluative measures used.

I. Decision Recording and Assessing:

A record was kept on decisions that were made so that the consequences of these decisions could be reflected upon. This technique has some definite advantages for evaluating complex programs. Incremental and precedent-setting decisions are often made without a conscious awareness that a decision is being made that may shape the future program. Having someone assigned to the task of recording decisions heightens awareness of these decisions. All decisions have intended consequences but there are often unanticipated consequences as well that may be advantageous or dysfunctional. In complex programs at the graduate level, there are not simple causal chains but complicated networks of multiple causes and intervening variables. In an on-going educational or social change program, decisions cannot be retracted readily and the social experiment started over again. A conscious awareness of the impact that decisions appear to be having allows new decisions to be made in order to capitalize on what is having positive effects or modify plans that appear undesirable.

Although the process of decision-making is more important for a program as it is underway than documentation of these is for others, critical decisions have been written up that may be of some benefit to others in designing programs.

Innovative programs are initiated by people who believe that some goals are not being attained by means of traditional programs or that significantly better means can be developed for attaining existing goals. In our case, it was believed that the traditional structure of universities meant that people in various behavioral and social science disciplines who might have an interest in educational research were isolated from one another. This meant that for graduate students wishing to pursue a

doctoral dissertation applying their disciplines to education, it was difficult to locate committee members who would be supportive and knowledgeable as advisors. For faculty members interested in conducting research in the field of education, there was no forum for discussing their ideas and interacting with faculty from other departments or the School of Education who might stimulate their research on significant educational problems. From the perspective of the program's directors, the program goals included more than the encouragement to apply various academic disciplines to education. The program was to expose members of each discipline to the contributions of other disciplines and to the criticisms and suggestions for their own research that might be made on the basis of alternative frames of reference. This would require that they explicate the assumptions and intuitions on which they based their research and become consciously aware of the strengths and limitations of their methodology. This was thought to be prerequisite to collaboration whether that collaboration across disciplinary boundaries manifested itself in persons working together on a particular problem or a person working alone but borrowing theories and methods that had been developed by other disciplines.

The first decision that had to be made in order to get the program operating was the method to be used for recruiting and selecting candidates. A number of alternatives were considered before a decision was reached. Some of the faculty members thought that a desirable strategy would be to select a specific topic and recruit students who would apply their discipline to it. This approach had been used before at the University of Chicago when the "problem" selected was a geographical area. Members of numerous disciplines conducted research. Although a great deal of knowledge about this one area resulted, this approach does not necessarily stimulate collaboration across disciplinary boundaries. Too

often, the results are discrete studies that do not fit together for more comprehensive understanding of problems or problem prevention.

In using a common problem approach, the topic must be sufficiently broad so that the members of the disciplines represented can define a problem to which they can contribute. Generally what results is that the topic does not represent a common problem but an entity manifesting multiple problems that are then independently researched. There was a practical concern with using this approach. If a topic was to be identified and students selected on the basis of their willingness to apply their discipline to it, rather extensive information would have to be supplied. It seemed unlikely that graduate students and their sponsoring faculty would feel confident that an appropriate dissertation topic could be ensured on this basis. It was also considered possible that the descriptive details of the topic selected might constrain the way in which persons would view education and define research problems.

The alternative decided upon was to have students submit dissertation proposals for research on educational problems. This was seen as having potential to generate more interest in the program. Students and faculty sponsors would have the opportunity to pursue research of interest to them. Because they would not have a perception of education imposed on them by the program, their perception of education and their definition of educational problems had the potential for making a new contribution. It was recognized that students, who had received the approval of their advisor for the research proposed and who had been selected by the program on the basis of the quality of their proposal, might resist the influence of the program. Students who were committed to completing dissertation research might view the program as supporting that endeavor and be unwilling to participate in new learning that would prolong that

research or distract them from their personal progress toward their doctoral degree.

It was explained to students that the program's staff had goals to be attained and that they would be required to contribute to this goal attainment. The Multi-disciplinary Program was to be a program and not merely a procedure for supporting the independent progress of individual students seeking doctoral research opportunities. Each student was expected to be a representative of his discipline and bring the theoretical and methodological expertise that he had acquired to bear on the discussions. Only by the active participation of all could students be exposed to the various perspectives of the disciplines represented. Unless intellectually stimulating exchanges occurred across disciplinary divisions on the topics of discussion, there would be no advantage in conducting a program as opposed to providing fellowships for students who remained in the social and intellectual climate of their own department. Students were expected to continue their progress in their own departments and in addition to progress in their ability to address an audience of persons in other disciplines and be receptive to the criticisms and suggestions from others that could enhance the significance of their own research.

Because the program was planned for doctoral level students, the assumption was made that students should be engaged in research that would lead to a completed thesis. Therefore the alternatives considered were restricted to whether the student should define the problem and propose the research as a criterion of admission or whether the program staff should select a broad problem or entity on which all candidates would be required to conduct research.

A development which occurred during the second year at the time Pau Lazarsfeld assumed the directorship suggests another alternative

that could be considered. Under Lazarsfeld's guidance the emphasis on process continued but was supplemented with a concern for materials production. These materials would be of two types. The first was to develop instructional materials that would serve the needs of our program and be made available for future programs. These would utilize existing knowledge but would organize it in appropriate pedagogical form so that students could acquire both skills and substantive knowledge about educational problems and research. The second type was to actually produce new knowledge that seemed necessary for an effective multi-disciplinary program in educational research. The latter tasks could only be accomplished by expanding the professional staff and involving students in the actual production of this knowledge. Therefore students were recruited specifically to undertake directed research.

These students attended the seminars but in lieu of doing doctoral research were given projects as defined and directed by the staff members. They participated as members of their respective disciplines in the seminars and quickly became integrated into the on-going program. The process of integration appeared to be enhanced by their identification and regular working relationship with the staff members. In the feedback sessions from students, it seemed evident that these students were benefiting from the entire program as much or possibly even more than the first year students. Some of the first year students volunteered to take on small directed research tasks in addition to their own research and seminar participation in order to acquire the opportunity to work closely with the professional staff. It seems probable that had the program continued, the second year students would have defined a problem for doctoral research after a period of directed research and participation in the program. The influence of the program might have then been reflected in the problem

definition and research design. This poses another alternative that could be considered in conducting a multi-disciplinary graduate program. Students might benefit from an introductory period in which they utilized the materials produced by our programs and simultaneously conducted research that was assigned and directed. Students having satisfactorily accomplished their directed research could then be given the opportunity to define their own problem for doctoral research.

During the first year, various strategies were used to foster group cohesion. A graduate student room was provided by LRDC so that students could share common facilities and interact informally with one another. Weekly brown bag luncheons were instituted with staff members participating so that instructional discussions could be encouraged. Faculty sponsors were invited and Center members were asked to stop in and talk with students. Social occasions were arranged. While these strategies appeared to be reasonably successful, it soon became evident that effective collaboration, peer tutoring and knowledge exchanges occurred most readily among those students who worked regularly in the graduate room. The regular use of the room depended largely upon the phase of student research. Those who were gathering data, using computers for data manipulation or undertaking library research spent little time at the desks that were available. The necessity of working at some other location much of the time tended to reduce the probability that they would use the student room even when the facilities were adequate for the task at hand. They would stop in to confer on occasion or to continue a discussion stimulated by a seminar.

The second year students who met regularly with the staff members in their directed research made greater use of the program facilities that were conveniently situated next door to staff offices. Their cohesion was

directly stimulated by the tasks they were doing and special strategies to foster group cohesion and integration of members were unnecessary. Students who voluntarily took on a task for one of the directed projects tended to remain in close contact with the others who were involved in that project.

Some of the students during the first year complained that they were not involved in program planning to the extent that they wished to be. The focal issue became the selection of guest speakers. The staff proposed that they form committees that would assume initiative and responsibility for general planning or planning of specific components. The committee to select guest speakers did provide an opportunity for group effort and was encouraged by the staff. Although some of the students felt strongly that it was their program and that they should determine their needs and help design ways of meeting these needs, there was a limited responsibility assumed. Assistance from the staff was required to follow through on the plans they initiated. Other students held quite the opposite attitude. They felt that they gained more from staff planned seminars and experiences. They felt that the staff members had program goals and that attempts by other students to insist on democratic participation tended to undermine goal attainment.

Tensions were managed by explaining to students that the funding for the program was not given merely for support of participants in an on-going program but in order to develop transportable programs, including materials. Students were free to give reactions or inputs and these were solicited by the staff in order to improve program objectives, processes and materials. Their active participation in planning was welcome provided that they were willing to assume the responsibility for helping to carry out the decisions and didn't merely wish to complain

about the decisions of others or make decisions that others would have effect. Quite open and frank discussions ensued in which students suggested that they had come through the era of student activism where "relevancy" of educational experiences and "doing your own thing" were popular slogans. Most of them were disillusioned with the ability of their peers to define what was relevant and felt more confident of the decisions made by faculty members who had broader experiences, expertise and legitimate criteria for relevancy. They now sought and respected responsive leadership. A rather general consensus formed that the students had reacted against the authoritarian structure of education and that they had gone to the other extreme demanding that they set the goals and objectives of their own education and that faculty members struggle to find the means to meet their objectives. Most of them now took the position that it was their responsibility to direct their own learning by taking advantage of the opportunities that were offered. In an integrated program such as Multi-D, it was ideal to have a responsive leader who was capable of bringing a wealth of knowledge and experience to any issue raised. However, graduate students ought not to expect that any program will be comprehensive enough to cover all the needs of all of the students. Therefore students ought to take advantage of what is offered and search themselves for any additional knowledge or skill development they might require. If the program leaders can responsively and responsibly include additional objectives defined on the basis of student articulated needs or desires, the students were fortunate.

In the student interviews at the conclusion of the program, students suggested that an unexpected outcome of the program was the self-assurance that some of them gained through being treated as professionals. This allowed them to take a more active role in directing their own learning,

searching for the answers to their own problems and interacting with faculty members both within the program and outside of it.

II. Product Evaluation:

The products themselves were continuously tried out with our students and revised. They were also given to other faculty members for professional review. The interest generated in some of the new materials that were developed was manifested in requests for these materials for other programs. The units on "Quantification as Language" and the accompanying exercises have been used for courses in the Sociology Department and are currently being pilot tested in the Graduate School of Social Work. The Qualitative Methodology has been reviewed by numerous members of the Anthropology Department and the Educational Anthropology group within the School of Education. This unit is an attempt to produce new knowledge that is lacking in the available literature. The faculty members from Anthropology who have reviewed it at various stages have been subsequently interviewed by Alice Troup. They have been most encouraging and have generously offered suggestions that can be used in its further improvement. This unit is not, as yet, in final form and will be revised before submitting it for publication.

The Frame of Reference study stimulated interest when it was presented as an on-going study and process at the AERA meetings. It has become a topic of discussion at formal and informal meetings. Its potential contribution to the Sociology of Knowledge has been recognized and many requests for copies of the working papers have been received. The concept frames of reference, the methodology devised for explicating various professional reference frames and the use of such a study in a graduate program which prepares students for collaborative, problem-centered research has generated extensive enthusiasm. This has reinforced

our perception that the study does produce knowledge for which there exists a need. Although our own program exposed the students to the on-going study itself, we intend to analyze the data collected and prepare the materials for publication. Each step of this study has been subjected to peer review. The comm[illegible]ll serve as an alternative to the instructional strategies u[illegible]n students. The published [illegible]e-rials will lack the stimulation that was offered to our students through the opportunity to meet the experts being interviewed and hear first hand their responses to the issues raised. It will, however, offer certain advantages in that the data will have been analyzed and the expert participants themselves will have reviewed the materials. The methodology will be included so that others may conduct their own interviews and replicate the experiences of our students should they wish to supplement the explication of reference frames that we have been able to do.

III. Participant Review of Processes:

Some seminar meetings were specifically devoted to discussion of the processes that had been used and the planning for the future. Staff members were available to interact with the students on a regular basis. If students did not initiate meetings to offer their reactions, the associate director would invite them to stop in for a chat in order to elicit responses.

IV. Evaluative Technique Used at the Conclusion of the Program:

In evaluating any educational program from preschool through to graduate level, the significant outcomes cannot be assessed adequately as the student completes the program of study. When very specific instructional objectives can be articulated, we may measure in-coming and out-going competencies and with sophisticated evaluative techniques feel reasonably sure of the part played by the educational program in the

progress of students. What is more problematic is whether the student will use these competencies now available for his own purposes and for his various roles in our society. Early educational programs that are conducted within the formally required years of schooling have the advantage that longitudinal, follow-up studies can be attempted as well as comparative studies on matched groups.

At the graduate level, the range of competencies that students have as they enter the program is both broad and differentiated. Since students in our program continued to meet the educational course requirements within their own department, out-going competencies would reflect the professional growth fostered by the departmental program as well as the Multi-D Program. In a multi-disciplinary program, the expectation is that they will have gained experiences and acquired competencies that supplement their education within their discipline. These competencies will be reflected, if the program has been successful, in their attitudes, the quality of their future research, and the increase in the range of theoretical and methodological expertise they can draw upon.

A multi-disciplinary program requires exposure to other disciplines, to various approaches to problem definition, to various methodologies, concepts, and research techniques. This is accomplished through group experiences and an inevitable tension exists because adapting to the individual differences becomes much more problematic. During the conduct of our program, we attempted to ensure sufficient variation to meet the diverse needs of all of our students. Not all students would profit equally from any one seminar but we hoped that all students would be gaining new experiences, skills, and knowledge during most of them.

At the conclusion of the program, the students were interviewed in small groups. Questions were asked not only to elicit individual

responses but to stimulate discussion and reflection. One of the objectives of the program had been to develop the student's ability to be constructively critical. Each student had exposed his own research design, methodology and research programs to critical review by the participants. It seemed reasonable and just to provide an opportunity to apply constructive criticism to the program itself.

There were e advantages to be gained in having me conduct these interviews Be student support had been terminated, there were no further d. wards to be offered and, therefore, no incentive for constraining opinions, attitudes and criticisms. At most, the students could hope for letters of recommendation and assistance in locating job opportunities. These requests were more profitably directed to Paul Lazarsfeld. Although I had had the role of associate program director, and this formal differentiation had been acknowledged and respected by the students, I had participated and profited by my involvement in many respects as a peer. I had presented my own doctoral research and had interacted frequently as a member of the group from the discipline of sociology. My full time commitment to the program had made me easily accessible and a rather informal rapport with the students had been established. The interviews seemed likely to elicit frank and open discussion.

The first interview question was what was your motivation initially in applying to Multi-D? With the first group of students, the immediate response was hesitant laughter from one student who frankly admitted that the student support had attracted him. The discussion that ensued revealed some interesting data. All of the students had had some form of student support at the time they applied. There was no appreciable difference in the amount of the stipend provided by Multi-D and that which they would have received from other sources although several mentioned

that the 12 month basis was appreciated and utilized by them at advanced levels. Those who held teaching assistantships pointed out that to receive a stipend for learning and pursuing doctoral research had distinct advantages over teaching assistantships. Although the students valued their teaching experiences, they felt that the tasks of teaching assistantships were time-consuming and tended to impede their progress in completing doctoral requirements. Students generally agreed that graduate students do profit by teaching assistantships as part of the graduate experience but that after a term or two, very little more is gained for the effort required. Students who had been receiving scholarships from various sources that demanded nothing other than continuing progress on the part of the students appreciated the freedom to direct their own studies and research but felt in need of a more structured environment. The appeal of the Multi-D Program was that it offered structured opportunities for learning and research while allowing sufficient freedom in terms of personal professional goal attainment.

Students were asked what their personal goals or expectations had been when they entered the program. One student asserted that he had had a very narrow and specific goal of completing his Ph.D. He had done so, had appreciated the opportunity provided by the program, had learned how others define problems and conduct research and had become more generally interested in education as a phenomenon for research. He had utilized concepts and methods borrowed from other disciplines successfully in his research and had profited by discussions with qualitative researchers. He was to assume an assistant professorship in an academic department of his own discipline in another university. Whether or not he pursued further educational research would depend on the availability of research support and approval within his department. He would probably seek and welcome such support and if given the opportunity would teach a course on the application of his discipline to educational problems.

Other students had goals which included both an interest in pursuing educational research and becoming exposed to students and faculty members from other departments who shared this interest. Some students who had already chosen to do a doctoral thesis involving an educational problem before the program was announced found it difficult to set up a committee of faculty members who were enthusiastic about the topic. Even when this was accomplished there was a problem locating a departmental member who had much knowledge about the field of education. Faculty members willing to become major advisors frequently had more enthusiasm than experience in the area of educational research. The announcement of the program was seen by both students and faculty members as an opportunity to overcome the lack of substantive knowledge about education and educational research. The establishment of a special program to train people in educational research gave a legitimacy to the pursuit and suppressed some faculty members who might otherwise have considered it an undesirable area for problem definition.

Among another group of students interviewed, a student said that the chairman had called together a group of graduate students whom he thought might be interested in the program at the time the announcement was received. The student commented that because student support opportunities were scarcely sought by his department, it frankly wouldn't have surprised him if the meeting was to generate enthusiasm for astrophysics. Somewhat to his amazement the area of research was to be education, an interest he had long had. He realized that the chairman himself had an interest in education and the student felt himself fortunate to have been called to the meeting. Later discussions with the other students from this department revealed that they too had had some active

or latent interest in the area which presumably the chairman had been aware of and that it was not merely a happy coincidence or an attempt merely to enlarge student support opportunities within the department.

Several students in all of the groups interviewed mentioned their need to broaden their contacts. They felt that they were getting over-socialized into their discipline. They talked with people in their own department, thought like people in their own department, spoke in a disciplinary jargon, gravitated to persons in their own field even after the working or studying day. They felt a need to meet people from other disciplines and exchange intellectual ideas so that they didn't become too narrow and unable to communicate with others.

Other students suggested that perhaps they were inadequately socialized. Even after several years in graduate school they weren't sure that they were becoming professionals committed to their discipline. They had little opportunity to assess what they had learned outside the department and its demands. Since graduate students are surrounded by graduate peers who have shared the same course experiences and faculty members who have even more expertise, attention is focused on what you are still incapable of doing rather than the accumulated skills and knowledge that you have gained. As one student expressed it, "The first time that I ever heard myself called an anthropologist was in the Multi-D program. When Dr. Lazarsfeld asked me how I, as an anthropologist, would view some problem, I felt a mixture of bewilderment, apprehension and pride." Many of the students agreed that they had had similar experiences. They were not accustomed to faculty members treating them as serious members of a discipline but rather as students. The program influenced their own sense of identity. They discovered what knowledge, conceptual approaches, methodological and theoretical

contributions they could make. As one student put it, "I learned more about my discipline and my department from the Multi-D experience than I had from my experiences within the department." This student had been doing directed research on one of the methodological units and she found that she gained more rapport with the members of her own department as she shared with them the work she was doing in Multi-D.

Many students found that they gained an understanding of the strengths and the limitations of their own discipline as well as those of other disciplines.

The students were asked to react to the various guest speakers that had been invited from our own or other universities. All of the students felt that these had been significant occasions which broadened their own knowledge of contemporary research in the educational field. These sessions provided intellectual stimulation well beyond the traditional colloquia series held on the campus because guests were given information on the program itself, the disciplines represented among the participants and the guidelines used for all presentations. They were permitted to discuss their research, design, methodology and results with interruptions by students or staff only to request clarification on specific points. When they had finished their presentation, the staff and students were free to challenge, question or criticize the design, underlying assumptions, methods, or to make suggestions for further research. One guest remarked that he hadn't occupied a "hot seat" like that for a long time and that it was a stimulating, if somewhat exhausting experience. Peter Rossi, who had done his own doctoral research at Columbia University while Lazarsfeld was the chairman of his department, asked if he could have a second doctoral degree for the defense of his research. One of the professors from our own university requested the opportunity to submit another piece of educational research because he found the criticisms and suggestions so

helpful. He was invited back again to do so. The students themselves had found it a type of anticipatory socialization since it permitted them to take in the role of professional peer.

The reactions of the students to particular speakers varied considerably. Invariably the guest considered most enlightening or stimulating by some was perceived by others as well down the list in rank order. Although students sometimes ranked members of their own discipline most highly, there was an additional pattern to their responses. They tended to rank highly those who shared their preference for qualitative or quantitative methodology. They claimed to learn most when the speaker came within that preference group but from another discipline. Some students made use of these contacts and exchanged papers with these guests later or, in the case of on-campus guests, have interacted with them subsequently.

An unanticipated outcome for students was the opportunity provided to learn more about the resources on their own campus. Many students took formal courses with faculty that they met from outside their own department, took courses recommended by other students, became exposed to additional libraries, consultants, and facilities. The Multi-D program served as a meeting ground and clearing house that become necessary when the specialization into various disciplines isolates scholars and researchers from one another.

The assistance offered by the program to the students and faculty in gaining access to schools and communities was considered a major asset.

Student Outcomes

During the course of participating in Multi-D the following students received their Ph.D.'s.

Eugene Rathswohl--During the first year, he completed his thesis and became an assistant professor in the Department of Information Sciences.

Jake Milliones--Midway through the second year, he completed his Ph.D., became an Assistant Professor in Clinical Psychology and is now the Associate Director of Right Start, a program that works with the families and children from poverty environments (predominantly Black but not restricted to Blacks) in order to improve their educational opportunities and attainment.

William DiPietro--He completed his thesis and received his Ph.D. in the last month of the program. He is an Assistant Professor in Economics at the University of Baltimore and hopes to obtain research funds to continue applying economics to educational problems.

Daniel Bar-Tal--Completed his Ph.D. in the fall following completion of the program and has a post doctoral position at LRDC. He is applying Social Psychology to educational problems and is part of a group within the LRDC concerned with social contexts of education.

Joseph Shimron--He completed his Ph.D. immediately following the Multi-D program and has a post doctoral position at the University of California, San Diego where he is continuing in educational research.

The following students are completing their Ph.D.'s with alternative support arrangements:

Neil Alper--He is a teaching assistant in the Economics Department and is completing his educational research.

Janet Adams--She is working exclusively on her research on educational planning in Pennsylvania. She attends meetings at LRDC, keeps in contact with LRDC-Harrisburg developments and has acted as a consultant to the Implementation Research at LRDC.

Ronald Barrett--He is a research assistant in the pediatric-psychology program at University of Pittsburgh.

Robert Eckert--When Multi-D was terminated, he took a full-time position with a government-affiliated research organization in Washington. He is actively involved in some educational evaluation research.

David Ford--During the second year, he gave up his student participation and became a Multi-D staff member working with Paul Lazarsfeld on Quantitative Methodology. He is currently completing his thesis and is applying for positions elsewhere.

Robert Harchareck--He is working exclusively on his thesis and expects to complete his Ph. D. this term. He is actively seeking an educational research position.

Bob Holmes--He changed his field from Social Psychology to Counselor Education with the intention of becoming a practicing professional working with Black students rather than continuing in research.

Charles Penoi--He interrupted his doctoral research in order to assist with the Frames of Reference Study but will complete his comprehensive paper on Follow Through and will probably continue in Implementation research.

Judy Rosen--She was a second year research assistant and did not do doctoral research. She has at least temporarily decided to teach in a secondary school rather than continue in research.

Theodora St. Lawrence--When the program terminated, she became an LRDC graduate assistant in order to complete her anthropological research at an LRDC developmental school. She has completed her field research and is seeking an Assistant Professorship in Anthropology--Education.

Carolyn Schumacher--She completed the data compilation for her study of the effects of schooling on intergenerational social mobility and is writing her thesis.

John Skvoretz--He is an Assistant Professor in Anthro-Sociology Department at the University of South Carolina where he is completing his research on the flow of information through a school that is used by school personnel for defining their roles.

Sally Siciliano--She left the program during its first year when her husband entered law school at another university. She planned to continue her own graduate education in educational psychology.

Todd Simonds--He was a first year student in Sociology at the time he became a graduate research assistant in evaluation. He is continuing his graduate education and is undertaking research tasks at the Urban Center.

Charles Teggatz--He was a second year research assistant who worked with Burkart Holzner on the Frames of Reference Study. He is now assistant to Robert Glaser at LRDC where he is heavily involved in educational research administration and the editing of materials.

Francis Terrill--During the second year, he withdrew from Multi-D because his program in clinical psychology applied to education problems required that he undertake an internship at another site. He has completed his Multi-D research, has almost completed an internship in Florida and will probably join the Right Start program at the University of Pittsburgh when he completes his Ph. D.

Alice Troup--She was a research assistant in the second year of Multi-D who worked with Paul Lazarsfeld on Qualitative Methodology. She expects to continue her professional career in educational anthropology after her maternity leave.

Rebecca Wiegers--She has passed her overview in Educational Psychology and is completing her thesis applying attribution theory to problems of educational achievement